

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

KEITH VERNON DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN WETZEL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 4:21-CV-00826

(Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Carlson)

ORDER

AUGUST 11, 2021

Plaintiff filed the instant action on May 6, 2021, and it was jointly assigned to the undersigned and to a magistrate judge. Upon designation, a magistrate judge may “conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and . . . submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations.”¹ Once filed, this report and recommendation is disseminated to the parties in the case who then have the opportunity to file written objections.²

On June 23, 2021, Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, to whom this matter is jointly assigned, issued a thorough report and recommendation recommending that the matter be transferred to the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

¹ 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B).

² 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1).

No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed. For portions of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made, the Court should, as a matter of good practice, “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”³ Regardless of whether timely objections are made by a party, the District Court may accept, not accept, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁴

Because I write solely for the parties, I will not restate the facts, but will instead adopt the recitation of facts as set forth by the magistrate judge. I have conducted a de novo review here and found no error.

AND NOW, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Magistrate Judge Carlson’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 9) is **ADOPTED in full.**
2. The matter shall be transferred to the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann

Chief United States District Judge

³ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Intern., Inc.*, 702 F. Supp. 2d 465, 469 (M.D. Pa. 2010) (*citing Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that judges should give some review to every report and recommendation)).

⁴ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.